## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 are currently pending.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,961,212 to Marui et al. ("Marui") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,820 to Courtis et al. ("Courtis"). Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Marui discloses "an electronic device comprising control means for providing the device with a plurality of selectable operating modes, the operating modes defining respective sets of operating parameters for functions of the device; wherein each operating mode of the device has an associated library of stored voice signals for use by the voice detection means when the operating mode concerned is selected." The Office Action further asserts that Mauri discloses "voice detection means for receiving an input voice signal and for providing voice activation of at least one function of the device, the voice detection means being operable to compare an input voice signal with a library of stored voice signals and to output a control signal on the basis of that comparison." The Office Action acknowledges that Marui fails to disclose "the stored voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device."

The Office Action asserts that column 2, lines 25-38 and column 4, lines 17-35 of Courtis teaches "in an analogous art, that wherein the stored voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device (input by a user...microphone)." The Office Action asserts that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the stored voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device in order to provide voice-activation of the telephone numbers previously stored by the user."

Courtis describes a portable radio telephone provided with a headset having a user actuable switch and a microphone. Courtis further describes that the portable radio telephone includes speech recognition means for recognizing speech information input via the microphone and deciphering words or numbers based on comparisons with speech patterns stored in the radio telephone. Courtis further describes that the speech patterns may be embedded in microprocessors during production and/or may be recorded in rewritable memory by a user. Courtis describes that each memory location in a memory contains a voice tag, a name, and a

telephone number. Column 4, lines 29-31 of Courtis describes that the voice tag is defined as "a sound waveform which is typically a sample of the user's voice received by the microphone." Courtis further describes a processes of selection and dialing of a telephone number in which a user presses a button on the radio telephone, speaks a name of a person to be dialed into the microphone, and that the telephone number associated with the best match voice tag is recalled and used by the radio telephone to dial the number.

Courtis is primarily directed to selection and dialing of telephone numbers. Applicant respectfully submits that Courtis does not teach or suggest a device having a number of operational modes in which each operation mode of the device has an associated library of stored voice signals that is used when the device is in that particular operational mode. Applicant respectfully submits that Courtis contains no teaching or suggestion of a device having a plurality of operating modes wherein each operating mode of the device has an associated library of user stored voice signals for use by a voice detection means when an operating mode concerned with the particular operating mode is selected as found in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Marui and Courtis fails to teach or suggest at least this features of independent claim 1. Moreover, even it could be assumed that the cited combination of Mauri in view of Courtis would arrive at the invention of independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the cited combination, as Mauri contains no teaching or suggestion of the use of a library of voice signals stored by a user. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Mauri in view of Courtis and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 2 is directed to "an electronic device having a plurality of user selectable operating modes, each operating mode defining a set of operating parameters for the device, and having at least one voice activated function which is responsive to an input voice signal, wherein reference voice signals are stored in the device by at least one user of the device and wherein the reference signals are stored in groups, each of which relates to a specific operating mode of the device." The Office Action asserts that Marui teaches some of the features of Marui, but acknowledges that Mauri fails to disclose "reference voice signals are

stored in the device by at least one user of the device." The Office Action further asserts Courtis teaches "in an analogous art, that wherein reference voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device." The Office Action further asserts that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include reference voice signals are stored in the device by at least one user of the device in order to provide voice-activation of the telephone numbers previously stored by the user." For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Mauri in view of Courtis fails to teach or suggest at least the features of independent claim 2 of " wherein reference voice signals are stored in the device by at least one user of the device" and "wherein the reference signals are stored in groups, each of which relates to a specific operating mode of the device." Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 2 distinguishes over Mauri in view of Courtis and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 2 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 6 is directed to "a method of operating an electronic device which has a plurality of operating modes for defining operating parameters of the device, and which has at least one voice activated function." The method includes "storing reference voice signals in groups"; "associating the said groups with respective operating modes of the device"; and "using an associated group of reference signals for voice signal matching in a chosen operating mode." The Office Action asserts that Marui teaches some of the features of Marui, but acknowledges that Mauri fails to disclose "reference voice signals are stored in the device by at least one user of the device." The Office Action further asserts Courtis teaches "in an analogous art, that associating the said groups with respective operating modes of the device." The Office Action further asserts that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include reference voice signals are stored by at least one user of the device in order to provide voice-activation of the telephone numbers previously stored by the user to suit the user's preferences based on the user's operational profiles." For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 distinguishes over Mauri in view of Courtis and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 and 7-8 are dependent upon and include the features of their respective independent claims 1, 2, and 6. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent

claims 1, 2, and 6, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-5 and 7-8 also distinguish over Mauri in view of Courtis and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 3-5 and 7-8 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael W. Maddox

Michael W. Maddox
Registration No.: 47,764
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant